

servation are full of the horror of that perversion from righteousness, what must be the picture as God sees it? Viewed from the standpoint of his absolute perfections it must be infinitely more hideous to him than it is to us. But looking at the great problem from the standpoint of his infinite love, his infinite wisdom and power, we are filled not simply with hope, but with an absolute conviction that he will not fail to wipe out this dark blot of sin and suffering from the fair page of his boundless universe. Sin and death are not eternal, and the day must come when God will be "all in all."

To accomplish this victory of righteousness, this victory of love, the utmost resources of the Godhead are employed. As the price and pledge of final victory God has given himself, and in the emblems of his broken body and shed blood are set forth the evidences of this wonderful transaction where the Creator intervened for the salvation of the world by himself expiating the guilt of his creatures, and satisfying by his own sufferings the inexorable demands of fundamental righteousness.

Our Saviour had reached the end of his earthly ministry, and what a ministry it was. There was plenty of preaching, but no theology; there was intense activity of benevolence, but almost exclusively of a temporal nature. What, let us ask, was the chief significance of that ministry? It was the setting forth of the Man Christ. It was the luminous exposition and exemplification of character, according to God's thought and God's will, for, after all, character must lie at the basis of possible salvation.

We cannot be saved either in our sins or our imperfections. Indeed so intensely true is this that we cannot possibly be saved so long as we possess the slightest natural tendency to sin. "Except ye be born again" is proof positive that both the voluntary and the involuntary tendency to sin must be replaced by an absolute, dominant and exclusive tendency to righteousness. We must not however confuse the beginnings and progressive stages of this great work of Grace with its final completion, for a man is saved potentially just as soon as he begins to be saved.

Ruined over and over by the sin in us, constantly bearing its crop of sins, reinstatement becomes the first essential step toward salvation. And since there could be no reinstatement, no pardon, no setting at rights in the great court of Righteousness, without a full satisfaction of the penalty of the broken law, and furthermore since it was and is impossible for the sinner to pay this penalty, infinite

Love laid on the one who alone was able to bear the dreadful wrath of violated law the inexorable necessity of bearing it, and for this reason "He bore our sins in his own body on the tree."

It was the last request of this unspeakable, unsearchable love that those who were thus sheltered by it from "the wrath to come" should in tender and fitting memorial perpetuate a deed to which not all the ages can furnish a parallel. That broken body and that shed blood of him who gave himself for us, who went down into deep, dark death that we might have life eternal, who suffered agonies untold that we might enjoy the bliss unspeakable,—is it any wonder that millions of grateful souls taste, with sweet response of love, the emblematic proofs of a love so divine, and a sacrifice so unselfish and sublime? "As oft as ye eat this bread, as oft as ye drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till he come." Let a thousand ages lapse, and yet there will be found numberless worshipers who shall reverently spread that table, and freshly embalm the memory of that dying scene when amid darkened heavens and trembling earth our Lord finished the world's salvation, and peopled eternity with blessed immortals.

But it is more than a memorial, and it means more than expiation. The Atonement is but the foundation upon which to build the eternal life. Very essential is the foundation, for without it the building cannot stand, but without the building there would be little need for the foundation. We see and accept the divine atonement which cancels all the past debt, when lo! wonderful transformation! immediately a new nature is seeded in the bed soil of our being, very small perhaps in its beginnings, like the mustard seed among seeds, but vitalized by a divine vigor which makes it persevere unto the perfect maturity and dominance of the *New Creature*.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

G. W. RENCH.

The Lord's Supper is distinctly a Bible term. While not used frequently in the Bible, it is used definitely where it is used. If we allow the Bible to be its own interpreter we can scarcely miss its meaning of the Lord's Supper. In I Cor. XI, we find Paul offering a rebuke to one of the early congregations concerning this supper and from his criticism directed against the people—not against the supper—we are able to understand what he means when he uses this term. I quote from the Revised Version. In the 20th verse, Paul says, "When therefore ye assemble yourselves together, it is not possible to eat

the Lord's Supper." Why, Paul? Is it because this supper is no such thing? Is it because this supper is nothing but the passover of the Jew? Is it because you do not want us to eat a supper together? Here is his answer: "For in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry and the other is drunken."

Now why not *take* Paul's reason. If you haven't an "ax to grind" in defending some pet theory that Paul's reason knocks all to pieces you will accept his reason and be at ease. Could there be anything put more plainly? "For in your eating each one taketh before other his own supper." Was there any fault found with this congregation because they kept this supper—this meal? No. The fault was found because by some taking their supper before others it left some without anything to eat. Those who took before others their own supper acted as though they were half-starved and could not wait until all was in readiness; hence, Paul says to those greedy brethren "Have ye not houses to eat and drink in?"

Now, again, what was the result of their hasty eating? Paul says that it left some hungry. But if a pinch of bread and a sip of wine is the Lord's supper, as many practice and teach, then how much better off would these poor brethren have been had they been permitted to eat! Would they not have been hungry still? The fact that some who were not allowed to eat were left hungry ought to convince any candid mind that what they had to eat for the Lord's supper would satisfy hunger. Remember, Paul did not reprove these brethren who got no supper, because they were hungry, but he reproveth those who cheated them out of their suppers. Such manners could not be the Lord's supper.

Another reason why the bread and wine (communion) is not the Lord's supper is given in the 25th verse of this same chapter. Paul says, "In like manner also the cup, after supper." Don't you see? As the Lord had given the bread so he gave "also the cup after supper." AFTER SUPPER. Why in the name of reason contend that the bread and wine is the Lord's supper when Paul says it was given after supper? Don't you think he knows? Possibly his statement does not suit you, but you will find it much better for *you* to change than to undertake to change Paul. Do you not think it would look about as well for you to follow Paul and Christ as to parade yourself before the world as the leader and Christ and Paul the followers?

Says one, "I can easily see that these Corinthian brethren were reproveth for